

Appl. No. : 09/754,406
Filed : January 2, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-28 and 32-37 remain pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11, 13-28 and 32-37 in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-11, 13-28 and 32-37 are unchanged. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in light of the present remarks and the interview is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-11, 13-28 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,648,913).

The Bennett reference appears directed to assigning a delay budget for each connection (wire) in the circuit based on the timing preference set by users. This delay budget is assigned in such a way that the overall circuit timing is met and does not dynamically consider how much less or how much more the other wire delays will be reduced against their budget. Therefore, Bennett describes a static approach as opposed to the dynamic nature of Applicant's methods. For example, Bennett does not address iteratively or recursively performing delay reduction, as claimed. By way of further example, with respect to delay reduction, Bennett does not disclose considering certain nodes or inputs in an order related to slack or location.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Bennett reference does not disclose every feature of each of Applicant's independent claims. The independent claims were discussed with Examiner Stevens and Applicant's representatives in a telephonic interview on April 28, 2006. It was discussed that Bennett does not disclose, for example, certain orderings, recursive reducing of delays, and iterative delay reduction. Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 21 and 25 are allowable over Bennett.

Dependent Claims

The dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore,

Appl. No. : 09/754,406
Filed : January 2, 2001

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 1, 2006

By: Raimond Salenieks
Raimond J. Salenieks
Registration No. 37,924
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2564987
042806